

Appl. No. 10/812,819
Amdt. Dated Feb. 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action Mailed November 17, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 15 have been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-5, and 7-15 remain pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lily et al. U.S. Patent 5,787,000 in view of Fischer U.S. Patent 6,675,055.

In response to this rejection, applicant has incorporated the limitation of claim 6 into independent claim 1, in order to patentably distinguish claim 1 from the prior art cited by the Examiner. Applicant submits that Lily et al. in view of Fischer fail to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1 of the present application. Specifically, amended claim 1 recites that the simulation analysis module comprises three sub-modules: a production scheduling sub-module for scheduling start times and finish times for mold parts to be produced; a part order scheduling sub-module for generating mold part order scheduling charts; and a Gunter analysis graph generating sub-module for transforming the mold part order scheduling charts into Gunter analysis graphs, which illustrate a distribution of each part order in corresponding machines (see paragraph [0016]).

Further, the limitations of amended claim 1 provide production scheduling and illustration of a distribution of part orders among various machines by way of a Gunter analysis graph according to relevant data. Lily et al. in view of Fischer fail to teach or suggest these advantages. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is unobvious under section 103 over Lily et al. in view of Fischer.

In any event, Examiner under Allowable Subject Matter stated to the effect that claim 6 is objected to, but would be allowable if re-written in independent

Appl. No. 10/812,819

Amdt. Dated Feb. 17, 2005

Reply to Office Action Mailed November 17, 2004

form including all the limitations of the base claim 1. Amended claim 1 is the equivalent of claim 6 re-written thus.

Accordingly, applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be removed, and that the claim be allowed.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to this objection, as detailed above, applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 6 into independent claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 2-5 and 7 now depend from claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Thus claims 2-5 and 7 should also now be allowable.

Claims 8-14 have been kept unchanged, since the Examiner said they were allowed. Claim 15 has been amended in respect of formalities only, and should remain allowed.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Yeh et al

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137